

# **Minutes of the Master Educators Guild**

## **Meeting: June 12, 2002**

(draft)

**Members Present:** Drs. Amorosa, Boyd, Clark, Cleveland, Diegmann, Forman, Haeberle, Kinzy, Kotecki, Langer, Martin, Patterson, Quaranta, Reteguiz, Robson, Scanlan, Stevenson, Stuart, Townes-Anderson, Vasan, and Zehring.

**Meeting Time:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:12 PM

**Meeting Location:** The meeting was held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

### **Old Business:**

1. **Topic:** Approval of Minutes of January 7, 2002. **Discussion:** Dr. Stevenson commented that she and Dr. Robson were to be on record as investigating a mentoring program at the last meeting. **Action:** Upon further reading of the minutes this information was found to be in the minutes and the minutes were thus approved unanimously.
  
2. **Old Business: Vice-President for Program Report-Dr. Forman.** Dr. Forman told the group that the program missions were the MEG website and the symposium. He then differed to Dr. Scanlan for his report on the website. Dr. Scanlan passed out copies of a report on the status of the website to the group along with an explanation of the project. He stated that the website is a low fidelity prototype being developed by Digital Media Services and is still a work in progress. He further went on to say that the site would have a needs assessment in the fall and undergo an evaluation by an advisory committee in a few weeks.

Dr. Scanlan continued by stating that they are still discussing the platform of the site and he is not happy with most of the proposals in that they are very expensive. Dr. Scanlan also handed out business-sized cards to members of the group for whom he still needs information to complete the site gallery of our members. Most of the cards held requests for short bios and pictures.

At this point Dr. Martin reiterated that this site is very important to the Guild; it represents who we are, what we do and where people can find us. Dr. Scanlan finished by saying that the site has six content related sections, three are staffed with member volunteers but we need three more. Areas of interest are clinical teaching, student evaluation, and active learning such as PBL, collaborative learning and case-based learning.

Dr. Reteguiz added a heartfelt thank you to Dr. Scanlan for his inspiring work on

the site and acquiring the grant. The rest of the group applauded as well. In concert with the above, Dr. Forman told of how at first he felt daunted with the task of the program development and grants and as he observed Dr. Scanlan's program take shape, he was impressed and views it as a great start for the Guild and the website as a lasting legacy to Dr. Scanlan and to the first year of the Guild.

Continuing the report of the Vice-President for Programming Report, Dr. Forman turned for the report on the Symposium to Dr. Martin. He began by thanking the many members of the Guild who participated in the development of the symposium. This included accomplishments such as obtaining the speakers, setting up the logistics with the Office of Continuing and Outreach Education, the budget support from Dr. Saporito, other support from Dean Gibson, the supporting secretaries and staff of central administration and the group facilitators who volunteered to run the breakout discussion groups. He also mentioned that the success of the program was due in no small part, to the help of Laura Barrett and her IAIMS work group.

He went on to say that he has had many favorable comments about the symposium and that the speakers were excellent, especially our last minute replacement speaker. Dr. Martin mentioned also that the concurrent and continual streaming of the morning session on the web has had 75 hits when he last checked. He thanked everyone again for what was perceived as a very successful endeavor.

**Topic: Guild Member Selection:** Dr. Reteguiz was recognized to lead a discussion of Master Educators' selection within the schools. Dr. Stevenson described the selection at RWJMS involving student members, members of the curriculum committee, and guild members being involved in the process but felt they had a "very small window of time." Dr. Vasani stated that at NJMS the process is sent to the dean to nominate and preside over selection of a committee for Guild selection. He feels that the process thus far, to the best of his knowledge stayed with the dean's office for a long time allowing inadequate evaluation of candidates.

Dr. Robson of the School of Public Health said that they were fortunate to have an associate dean that was supportive and held to the original stated guidelines. He said eight letters from students and letters from six members of the alumni association further supported the process at his school. He noted that their "partner" school, Rutgers University, also helped facilitate the process also.

Dr. Langer commented that at GSBS the process of Guild selection seems to have started with the Dean and ended with the Dean. This being the case there should be an intermediary committee in that selection process now that the Guild is maturing.

Dr. Stevenson commented that Dr. Gibson handed down a set of criteria to be used and unless we (The Guild) would like to change these criteria for selection, we should do what is necessary to see that the various schools uphold the criteria even if the process or personnel may vary from school to school.

Dr. Scanlan noted that at SHRP the selection representatives went down from sixteen to just a couple of people. He stated that presently the Master Educators have no vote in the process. He suggested faculty members being considered for the Guild should present an application with a teaching portfolio and sit for an interview. He imagined this would be a lengthy process. He concluded as others, that it seems that Deans have at this point, the final say.

Dr. Kotecki suggested to the group that we compile simple written outline documents as to how the selection process is currently setup at each school, include this as a short compendium and perhaps hybridize these into a unified document.

Dr. Scanlan then commented that perhaps the selection process does not have to be unified but in fact may be best served by having individual school criteria for selection based on what reflects the best of what happens in each component school.

Dr. Forman thanked Dr. Kotecki for the information she provided from the School of Nursing. He noted that at SOM he was recently asked by a member of the selection “committee” when the names were due for evaluation, and Dr. Forman found out that there were only two days left to the deadline, allowing for the potential of “no nominees.”

Dr. Forman went on to say that the process originally starts out with nominations from students, faculty and department chairs. However, no matter how great the numbers or magnitude of the recommendations for an individual, without the recommendation of the department chair, the potential candidate for the Guild has no chance. Dr. Forman agreed with Dr. Scanlan in that although this was not possible in the first year, now that we will be in our third and soon fourth selection process, the Guild should strive to become more proactive in the selection process.

At this point in the meeting Dr. Martin asked for one or two final comments on the selection process and then move on to the rest of the agenda.

Dr. Forman suggested that the selection process discussion be continued as an agenda item for the next time that we meet. Dr. Scanlan noted that we are now in a transition period on the selection process as it may change hands in part from administrative sanctioning to Master Educator control. He added that the new executive committee should soon meet with Dr. Saporito and Dr. Gibson on these matters.

Dr. Martin at this point wanted to include one more item under old business. He recognized and congratulated Dr. Elaine Patterson for her recent award on April 12, 2002. This was an award for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning and Technology. She received the award at the International Conference on College Teaching and Learning.

Dr. Martin asked Dr. Patterson to describe the process and how we may cultivate future award winners. Dr. Patterson commented on her research involving outcome measurements for students using online learning and spoke in general on technology and learning. Dr. Patterson went on to say that the conference was exciting, global in scope and that she will be attending again.

**3. New Business:** Dr. Martin began the installation of the 2002-2003 Guild Officers. These include: President, Dr. Catherine Kotecki; Vice-President for Programming, Dr. Craig Scanlan; Vice President for Finance, Dr. Marian Stuart; and now that we have more than 20 members the “member at large,” Dr. Terri Gross Kinzy. Dr. Martin then announced that he is now the immediate past president of the Guild. He thanked everyone for his or her help and cooperation and he apologized for the omission of Dr. Quaranta’s name on the program, but it is understood that the position of Secretary to the Guild is a two-year term.

Dr. Martin went on to congratulate Dr. Kotecki on her new presidency and presented her an engraved wooden chairperson’s gavel. Dr. Martin invited Dr. Kotecki to make some remarks, as she embarks on her new presidency.

Dr. Kotecki began by thanking Dr. Martin for his decorous, genteel, insightful, and capable leadership. She also gave special recognition to Dr. Craig Scanlan for his innovative contributions to the Guild. She thanked the volunteers for the mentoring committee consisting of Drs. Cleveland, Stevenson, Robson, Townes-Anderson, Patterson, and Forman. She added that although symposia are still expected to be generated by the Guild, our new focus should be to develop a strong mentorship program. An educational research project conducted in part by or sponsored by the Guild should be in the offing. A survey was noted that among new doctoral level faculty joining colleges and universities, 80% surveyed said that they felt comfortable with research; only 25 % felt that they were comfortable in teaching.

Dr. Kotecki in her inaugural address to the Guild also mentioned that she would like to see the Guild pursue the ideas proposed during the meeting to upgrade and/or clarify the Master Educator selection process. Dr. Kotecki also stated that she would be interested in pursuing more avenues of financial growth for the Guild including grant funding.

Dr. Kotecki noted that Dr. Stevenson in meetings past had alluded to mentorship programs already in place at RWJMS. Dr. Stevenson mentioned that RWJMS has an Associate Dean for Faculty Development and through this office, teaching portfolios,

and mentoring are encouraged. She went on to say that new faculty coming to RWJMS are sent letters telling them that they have been assigned mentors, who those mentors are, and how they can be reached. RWJMS also has a mentorship award in development.

Relative to the above subject Dr. Forman alluded to a recent article in *Academic Medicine* that USC had a mentoring program for 38 new faculty and the outcome was perceived as excellent with the vast majority of the group reporting that the program was very helpful.

It was agreed by consensus of the group that final assignment of mentors to specific faculty members would probably reside within the domain of department chairs.

Dr. Scanlan mentioned the possible concept of specific training of mentors leading to a Mentorship Certificate. Dr. Patterson noted that mentorship could also occur online.

Dr. Kotecki adjourned the meeting at 9:31 PM with a thump from her new gavel.

Respectfully submitted: Patrick Quaranta, Secretary, Master Educators' Guild.